

REMARKS

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are unpatentable under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 103. The Applicants have amended claim 1. Support for the amendments may be found in Applicants' specification on at least paragraphs [0090] and [0091]. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in condition for allowance.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-9 AND 11 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner alleges that claims 1-9 and 11 are claiming a system or a method that comprises software only. Applicants respectfully disagree. First claims 1-9 and 11 recite a system. Clearly a system is not software per se. The Examiner's attention is directed to Applicants' Specification, paragraphs [0035]-[0040] and [0090]-[0091]. The system may be implemented using computing devices that comprise a server, a processor, a memory for storing programs, data, etc, support circuits, I/O devices, etc. For example, the Applicants submit that paragraphs [0035]-[0040] cite one or more servers for specific functions that clearly comprise hardware. Furthermore, paragraphs [0090] and [0091] recite computing devices. However, to further clarify the teaching is not software per se, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite "wherein at least one of: said unified portal, said enterprise function module, said integrated business applications system or said database warehouse is implemented via a processor."

As such, Applicants' claims 1-9 and 11 properly recite a system that is fully supported by Applicants' specification and are directed to a statutory subject matter. As such, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-9, 11-20 AND 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being un-patentable over Campbell et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,871,193 B1, issued on March 22, 2005, hereinafter referred to as "Campbell" in view of Bansal et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/020593.

The Applicants believe the Examiner cited the above publication number in error and the intended reference is Bansal et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0120593 A1, published on June 26, 2003, hereinafter referred to as "Bansal." Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Campbell teaches an authentication bundle that supports authentication and authorization of users. (See Campbell, Column 11, Lines 25-55 and Column 18, Lines 51-67).

Bansal teaches a messaging service that decouples interacting applications to allow for flexibility in keeping inter-dependencies to a minimum. For example, a front-office application can continue to operate even if a back-office application is momentarily down. The messaging service has the characteristic to provision prioritizing the message processing. (See Bansal, Paragraphs [0641] - [0646], [0721] - [0728] and [0869] - [0871]).

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that Campbell and Bansal, alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose the novel system or method for a unified shared business application comprising an enterprise function module, for providing a common customer identifier (CCI) for users associated with a plurality of business channels of a plurality of enterprises, wherein the enterprise function module associates a CCI associated with each enterprise to each user accessing the unified portal, wherein said CCI provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer, as positively claimed by the Applicants' independent claims 1 and 12. Specifically, the Applicants' independent claims 1 and 12 recite:

1. A unified shared business application system, comprising:
a unified portal for authenticating and authorizing user preferences and restrictions;

an enterprise function module, for providing a common customer identifier (CCI) for users associated with a plurality of business channels of a plurality of enterprises, wherein said enterprise function module associates a CCI associated with each enterprise to each user accessing said unified portal, wherein said CCI provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer;

an integrated business applications system for integrating a plurality of business applications across products and services to produce integrated business applications in response to authorized user selections of at least one business application from said unified portal; and

a database warehouse for storing information associated with said business channels of said plurality of enterprises, each user, and said products and services, wherein at least one of: said unified portal, said enterprise function module, said integrated business applications system or said database warehouse is implemented via a processor. (Emphasis added).

12. A method of unifying and sharing business applications with respect to a user of a business channel, comprising:

authenticating and authorizing, at a unified portal of at least one server, user preferences and restrictions in response to a user request for access;

providing, at an enterprise function module of said at least one server, a common customer identifier (CCI) for users associated with a plurality of business channels of an enterprise, wherein said enterprise function module associates a CCI to each user accessing said unified portal, wherein said CCI provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer;

integrating, at an integrated applications system of said at least one server, in response to a user selection of a business application, information associated across a plurality of business applications with respect to products and services to produce integrated business applications in response to authorized user selections of at least one business application from said unified portal; and

storing, at a database warehouse of said at least one server, information associated with said business channels, each user, and said products and services. (Emphasis added).

In one embodiment, Applicants' disclosure teaches a system or a method, for a unified shared business application comprising an enterprise function module, for providing a common customer identifier (CCI) for users associated with a plurality of business channels of a plurality of enterprises, wherein the enterprise function module associates a CCI associated with each enterprise to

each user accessing the unified portal, wherein said CCI provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer. (See e.g., Applicants' Specification, paragraphs [0055] and [0058]). The Applicants' disclosure teaches that the user is associated with a CCI number and the CCI is used to identify a user with a particular enterprise. Additionally, from the perspective of the carrier, the CCI provides indicia of priority for servicing for an enterprise customer. In one example, the CCI is used to provide priority to customers that have higher priority ratings.

The alleged combination (as taught by Campbell) does not teach or suggest a system or a method for a unified shared business application comprising an enterprise function module, for providing a common customer identifier (CCI) for users associated with a plurality of business channels of a plurality of enterprises, wherein the enterprise function module associates a CCI associated with each enterprise to each user accessing the unified portal, wherein said CCI provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer.

The Examiner again argues that Campbell teaches a CCI that provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer. However, the cited paragraph is only concerned with whether a customer has authorization to access a service and thus whether access should be granted or denied. As such, the section cited by the Examiner in the Office Action in Campbell only discloses a typical authorization process, i.e., a user can access the service if the user is authorized. The Examiner's attention is directed to Campbell, Column 11, Lines 25-55 and Column 13, Lines 56-66. In fact, Campbell **teaches away** from Applicants' disclosure. Campbell only teaches user preferences being used to provide customized presentation to customers. The portal page is able to present information that a particular user indicated as information of interest to the user.

In the Office Action dated October 28, 2009, the Examiner argues that Campbell teaches ACL and then proceeds to conclude Campbell teaches CCI. The Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' CCI is not simply used to

grant or deny access, as argued by the Examiner. First, the CCI enables providing different levels of priority to customers and therefore provide different services for customers that have higher priority ratings. The Applicants' disclosure teaches providing priority to customers that have higher priority ratings by simply using the CCI. For example, the CCI is used to determine the priority, such that customers who have higher priority ratings will be treated preferentially than those customers with lower priority ratings. Hence, a CCI is clearly not an ACL. Second, the Applicants teach using the CCI directly to provide indicia of priority for servicing. The teachings of Applicants' disclosure advantageously enable the service provider to provide the appropriate level of service by simply using the CCI without the need for further requirement on the user.

Moreover, Bansal does not bridge the substantial gap left by Campbell because Bansal also fails to teach or suggest a system or a method for a unified shared business application comprising an enterprise function module, for providing a common customer identifier (CCI) for users associated with a plurality of business channels of a plurality of enterprises, wherein the enterprise function module associates a CCI associated with each enterprise to each user accessing the unified portal, wherein said CCI provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer.

The Examiner argues that Bansal teaches CCI provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer. However, the cited paragraphs in Bansal only teach decoupling of back-office and front office processes and prioritizing of messages in queue. (See Bansal, Paragraphs [0641]-[0646] and [0721]-[0728]). Bansal only teaches a messaging service that decouples interacting applications to allow for flexibility in keeping inter-dependencies to a minimum. For example, a front-office application can continue to operate even if a back-office application is momentarily down. The messaging service has the characteristic to provision prioritizing of the processing of the message in the queue. Bansal fails to teach any prioritization based on the common customer identifier. Bansal only teaches priorities of messaging queues. The mere fact of having a priority is not relevant to Applicants' teaching. The Applicants

specifically teach a CCI that provides an indicium of priority for servicing an enterprise customer. The CCI as taught by Applicants advantageously enables the service provider to provide the appropriate level of service by simply using the CCI without the need for further requirement on the user. Therefore, Bansal fails to close the significant gap left by Campbell. Thus, for all the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully contend that claims 1 and 12 are not made obvious by the combination of Campbell and Bansal.

Moreover, dependent claims 2-9, 11, 13-20 and 22 depend from independent claims 1 and 12, respectively, and recite additional limitations. As such, and for the exact same reason set forth above with regard to independent claims 1 and 12 being patentable over Campbell and Bansal, the Applicants submit that claims 2-9, 11, 13-20 and 22 are also patentable over Campbell and Bansal. As such, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicants submit that all of these claims now fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of a final rejection in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 842-8110, Ext. 130 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

January 28, 2010

Wall & Tong, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702



Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,400
(732) 842-8110, Ext. 130